

**REMARKS**

Favorable reconsideration of the present patent application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

In this Amendment claims 25-26 is added, claims 1, 3, 8-10, 12, 15-17 and 19-24 are amended, and no claims are canceled. As a result, claims 1-26 are now pending in the application. Support for the newly added claim can be found throughout the disclosure, for example, at pages 11-12 of the specification.

In the final Office Action of April 24, 2008, claims 8-11 and 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) in view of the paper entitled "Leveraging LDAP to Implement RBAC on the Web" (Bartz). Claims 1-7 and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of the Bartz paper. Claims 19-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of the Bartz paper further in view of U.S. Patent 6,385,651 (Dancs). It is noted with appreciation that the obvious-type double patenting rejection of claims 1-18 in view of U.S. Patent 6,832,377 (Havemose '377) has now been withdrawn.

*35 U.S.C. §102 and §103 Rejections in view of Bartz / Dancs*

The §102(b) rejection of claims 8-11 and 15-18, the §103 rejection of claims 1-7 and 12-14 in view of the Bartz paper, and the §103 rejection of claims 19-24 in view of the Bartz paper further in view of the Dancs patent are obviated in view of the present claim amendments. It is respectfully submitted that Bartz and Dancs, taken either singly or in hypothetical combination, do not teach or suggest the claimed features for at least the following reasons.

Some resources—for example, resources found on the Internet—require a user to register before access is granted. In most instances, a new or unregistered user desiring to access a particular resource is required to enter personal information such as name, credit card number or other billing information. Conventional methods of registering users for access to resources require the user to enter such information each time the user registers for a new resource. Such conventional methods of registration are cumbersome and inefficient. The various embodiments of the present invention involve universal registration for an information appliance network. As such, the present invention overcomes the inefficiencies of conventional systems for registering with a resource provider or other such server.

The Office cites the Bartz paper in the pending §102 and §103 rejections, and cites Dancs in one of the §103 rejections. However, the Bartz paper deals with authentication and authorization for providing access. Bartz does not pertain to *registration* as does the claimed invention. The Bartz system only confirms the identity of a previously registered user. By contrast, according to the specification of the present application, a user may enter registration information into a universal registration resource when utilizing a digital information appliance the first time or later when desiring to utilize charged content resources.”<sup>1</sup> Then, upon attempting to access a resource, “if the resource requires registration, the registration interface [e.g., DBO] may supply the needed information.”<sup>2</sup> The claims recite “requesting use of a first provider resource which requires said user registration information, wherein said first provider resource automatically retrieves said user registration information from said universal registration resource to enable said user to access said provider resource,” as per claim 1. Claim 8 recites

---

<sup>1</sup> Specification, paragraph [0029] sentence spanning pages 11-12.

“accessing a second resource which requires registration by the user; [and] in response to said second resource supporting universal registration and said user being universally registered, obtaining registration information for the second resource from the registration dynamic object; and allowing said user to access contents of said second resource in response to obtaining said registration information for the second resource.” The other independent claims recite similar features of differing scope.

The claimed invention differs from Bartz. The Bartz device uses the X.509 certificate of a *previously registered user* to authenticate that user for subsequent access following their registration. A user of the Bartz system has to already be registered with the system in order to gain access.

Furthermore, the claimed invention provides the same registration information from a single source to different content providers to gain access to their respective content. Claim 1 recites “requesting use of a first provider resource which requires said user registration information, wherein said first provider resource automatically retrieves said user registration information from said universal registration resource to enable said user to access said first provider resource; and requesting use of a second provider resource which requires said user registration information, wherein said second provider resource automatically retrieves said user registration information from said universal registration resource to enable said user to access said second provider resource.”

Consequently, the Bartz paper does not disclose or suggest features of the claimed invention.

---

<sup>2</sup> Specification, paragraph [0030].

The Office relies upon the secondarily cited Dancs patent to purportedly teach features of dependent claims 19-24. Dancs pertains to a preliminary user registration mechanism provided by a centralized authority for accessing Internet service providers. However, since Bartz involves authentication and authorization for already registered users rather than users registering with a content provider to gain access to the content, it is respectfully submitted that Bartz teaches away from combination with the Dancs patent. Therefore, the Bartz paper and the Dancs patent do not disclose or suggest features of the claimed invention.

It is respectfully submitted that Bartz and Dancs, taken either singly or in hypothetical combination, do not teach or suggest the claimed features thus overcoming the pending §102 and §103 rejections. Accordingly, a full examination on the merits is respectfully requested.

*Deposit Account Authorization / Provisional Time Extension Petition*

It is believed that no extension of time is required for this filing and the accompanying RCE Transmittal attends to all necessary fees. However, to the extent necessary, a provisional petition for an additional extension of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 50-0439 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. However, in the event there are any unresolved issues, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact applicant's representative, Scott Richardson, by telephone at (571)970-6835 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,



Scott Charles Richardson  
Reg. No. 43,436

The Brevetto Law Group, PLLC  
107 S. West Street, #765  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314  
telephone: (571)970-6835

**Date: July 10, 2008**